

1 Rosemary M. Rivas (State Bar No. 209147)

2 Email: rrivas@zlk.com

2 **LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP**

3 44 Montgomery Street, Suite 650

3 San Francisco, California 94104

4 Telephone: (415) 291-2420

4 Facsimile: (415) 484-1294

5 Eduard Korsinsky (to be admitted *pro hac vice*)

6 Email: ek@zlk.com

6 **LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP**

7 30 Broad Street, 24th Floor

7 New York, New York 10004

8 Telephone: (212) 363-7500

8 Facsimile: (212) 636-7171

9 Donald J. Enright (to be admitted *pro hac vice*)

10 Email: denright@zlk.com

10 John A. Carriel (to be admitted *pro hac vice*)

11 Email: jcarriel@zlk.com

11 **LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP**

12 1101 30th St., NW, Ste. 115

12 Washington, DC 20007

13 Telephone: (202) 524-4292

13 Facsimile: (202) 333-2121

14 *Counsel for Plaintiff Astley Davy*

15

16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

17 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

18 ASTLEY DAVY, individually and on behalf of all
19 others similarly situated,

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 PARAGON COIN, INC., JESSICA VERSTEEG,
23 and EGOR LAVROV,

24 Defendants.

Case No. 18-cv-00671

CLASS ACTION

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR
VIOLATION OF SECTIONS 12(a)(1) AND
15(a) OF THE SECURITIES ACT OF 1933**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

25 Plaintiff Astley Davy (“Plaintiff”), individually and on behalf of all other persons similarly
26 situated, by his undersigned attorneys, alleges in this Complaint for violations of Sections 12 and 15 of
27 the Securities Act of 1933 (the “Securities Act”), the following based upon knowledge with respect to
28 his own acts, and upon facts obtained through an investigation conducted by his counsel, which

1 included, *inter alia*: documents and solicitation materials released by Defendants (defined below), in
 2 connection with the Paragon ICO (defined below), public statements made by Defendants concerning
 3 Defendant Paragon Coin, Inc. (“Paragon”) and the Paragon ICO, and media publications concerning
 4 Paragon and the Paragon ICO. Plaintiff believes that further substantial evidentiary support will exist
 5 for the allegations set forth herein after a reasonable opportunity for discovery. Many of the facts
 6 supporting the allegations contained herein are known only to Defendants or are exclusively within
 7 their control.

8 **NATURE AND SUMMARY OF THE ACTION**

9 1. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated against
 10 Paragon, Jessica VerSteeg (“VerSteeg”), Egor Lavrov (“Lavrov,” together with VerSteeg, the
 11 “Individual Defendants,” and collectively with Paragon, “Defendants”) for their violations of
 12 Sections 12(a)(1) and 15(a), 15 U.S.C. §§ 77l(a)(1), 77o(a), of the Securities Act. Specifically, in
 13 connection with Paragon Initial Coin Offering (the “Paragon ICO”), which ran from approximately
 14 August 15, 2017 through October 16, 2017, Defendants raised at least \$70 million in digital
 15 cryptocurrencies by offering and selling unregistered securities in direct violation of the Securities Act.

16 2. From August 15, 2017 through September 15, 2017, Defendants ran the Paragon ICO
 17 “presale” during which time they purportedly “sold out” of 70,000,000 ParagonCoins (“PRG Tokens”)
 18 priced between \$0.75 and \$0.90 per PRG Token.¹ From September 15, 2017 through October 16, 2017,
 19 Defendants ran the Paragon ICO “crowd sale,” during which time PRG Tokens were offered and sold
 20 for \$1 each on the first day and the price thereafter increased by \$0.05 per day until the close of the
 21 Paragon ICO. Such price increases were clearly designed to entice early investments.²

22
 23 ¹ See JD Alois, *The Paragon ICO is Just Killing it as the Token Pre-Sale Sells Out*,
 24 CrowdFundInsider.com (Sept. 26, 2017, 10:30 p.m.), <https://www.crowdfundinsider.com/2017/09/122405-paragon-ico-just-killing-token-pre-sale-sells/>.

25 ² To note, Defendants also reduced the prices of PRG Tokens by offering “bonuses” as the Paragon
 26 ICO went on, resulting in a baiting of early investors, as well as late or repeat investors. For example,
 27 Defendants emailed Plaintiff on September 27, 2017, after he had already invested, a “promo code”
 28 offering a 25% bonus on his next purchase of PRG Tokens. As the Paragon ICO neared its conclusion,
 the offered “bonus” percentages likewise increased. For example, Defendants emailed Plaintiff promo
 codes on October 3, 2017, and October 12, 2017, offering 40% and 55%, respectively, in bonus PRG
 Tokens for any subsequent purchase.

1 3. On November 2, 2017, Defendants emailed Paragon ICO investors an update which
 2 indicated that during the Paragon ICO “crowd sale” they had collected 533 BTC and 8,092 ETH—
 3 worth approximately \$7.3 million and \$10.2 million, respectively, as of January 12, 2018. In this
 4 update, Defendants also stated that these amounts did not include any of the cryptocurrencies they
 5 collected during the Paragon ICO “presale.” Given that Defendants have represented that the Paragon
 6 ICO “presale” sold 70,000,000 PRG Tokens at a minimum price of \$0.75,³ and that the Paragon ICO
 7 “crowd sale” raised 533 BTC and 8,092 ETH, these representations indicate that Defendants collected
 8 at least \$70 million during the Paragon ICO.⁴

9 4. Defendants’ purported goal, or “mission statement,” in conducting the Paragon ICO
 10 was:

11 Paragon seeks to pull the cannabis community from marginalized to mainstream by
 12 building blockchain into every step of the cannabis industry and by working toward
 13 full legalization. Our strength lies in the unique blockchain/cannabis connection
 14 that uses smart contracts. We believe in blockchain, and we believe in the benefits
 15 of cannabis. More uses of cannabis are coming to light, and we want to accelerate
 16 that process. We believe cannabis is good for individuals and good for countries.
 17 We are passionate about moving forward in an ethical, morally responsible, and
 18 legal way.⁵

19 5. In other words, Defendants marketed the Paragon ICO as offering a path towards
 20 legalization of cannabis and a way to solve nearly every issue facing the cannabis industry. As
 21 discussed herein, the Paragon ICO was in actuality a way for Defendants to raise capital to purchase
 22 real estate.

23 6. Depending on the date in which the investment was made, the core offer during the
 24 Paragon ICO was 1 PRG Token for \$0.75–\$2.50, payable in Bitcoin (“BTC”), Ether (“ETH”), Litecoin
 25 (“LTC”), Dashcoin (“DASH”), Zcash (“ZEC”), Ripple (“XRP”), Monero (“XMR”), Ethereum Classic
 26 (“ETC”), or Waves coin (“WAVES”). The Paragon ICO was a clear offer and sale of securities,

27 ³ *Supra*, note 1.

28 ⁴ One website that tracks the amount of funds raised by initial coin offerings estimates that the Paragon
 29 ICO raised over \$74 million. *See* Top10BestUpComingICOS.com, <https://top10bestupcomingicos.com/partners/paragon/> (last visited Jan. 30, 2018) (stating the Paragon ICO raised \$74,647,589).

30 ⁵ *See* Paragon, *Paragon Whitepaper Version 1.0*, (2017), <https://paragoncoin.com/whitepaper.pdf> at
 31 pg. 7.

1 because, *inter alia*, Defendants advertised, and Plaintiff and other Paragon ICO investors reasonably
 2 expected, that the PRG Tokens would be worth more than the ETH, BTC, LTC, DASH, ZEC, XRP,
 3 XMR, ETC, or WAVES (collectively, the “Funds”) they invested. Additionally, Defendants have
 4 explicitly referred to Paragon ICO participants as “investors” and repeatedly stressed their intention to
 5 “keep the value of PRG strong and growing,”⁶ and that PRG Tokens would be “long term growth
 6 assets.”⁷

7. The Securities Act’s registration requirements are designed to protect investors by
 8 ensuring they are provided adequate information upon which to base their investment decisions. Absent
 9 registration, issuers of securities are able to tout their investment opportunities with no limitations
 10 whatsoever. For example, an issuer could omit any information that would make a potential investor
 11 think twice before investing (*e.g.*, conflicts of interest or major setbacks to core product lines), or peddle
 12 its securities using unbounded exaggerations regarding the progress of its products, business plan,
 13 business strategies, or even fabricate the existence of relationships with vendors or other business
 14 partners.

8. Due to the varied and innumerable ways in which investors can be, and are likely to be,
 15 manipulated and harmed absent any of the protections under the federal securities laws, Sections 5 and
 16 12(a)(1) of the Securities Act provide for strict liability against any person who offers or sells an
 17 unregistered security. As detailed herein, the Paragon ICO was, and has been at all times, been an offer
 18 and sale of unregistered securities and thus, Defendants are strictly liable under Section 12(a)(1) of the
 19 Securities Act.

9. Importantly, proof of deceptive activity or calculated deprivation of investors’ rights
 21 and protections under the federal securities laws is not required or determinative as to Plaintiff’s claim.
 22 This is because Defendants are liable simply by virtue of having offered and sold unregistered securities
 23 during the Paragon ICO. Nevertheless, Defendants’ deceptive activities are outlined herein to stress
 24 the urgency and need for immediate judicial intervention to preserve Plaintiff’s and other Paragon ICO
 25 investors’ significant financial interests which Defendants currently control, and to rectify existing and
 26

27

⁶ *Id.* at pg. 15.

28⁷ *Id.* at pg. 31.

1 future irreparable harm to Plaintiff and Paragon ICO investors. For these reasons, Plaintiff on behalf
 2 of himself, and all similarly situated Paragon ICO investors, seeks compensatory, injunctive, and
 3 rescissory relief, which would provide rescission and repayment of all investments into the Paragon
 4 ICO, as well as secure and conserve such funds until repayment.

5 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

6 10. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question
 7 jurisdiction) and Section 22 of the Securities Act (15 U.S.C. § 77v) because Plaintiff alleges violations
 8 of Sections 12(a)(1) and 15(a) of the Securities Act.

9 11. This Court has personal jurisdiction over each of the Defendants because each either
 10 conducts business in and maintains operations in this District or is an individual who either is present
 11 in this District for jurisdictional purposes or has sufficient minimum contacts with this District as to
 12 render the exercise of jurisdiction by this Court permissible under traditional notions of fair play and
 13 substantial justice.

14 12. Venue is proper in this District under Section 22 of the Securities Act, 15 U.S.C. § 77v,
 15 as well as under 28 U.S.C. § 1391, because: (a) the conduct at issue took place and had an effect in this
 16 District; (b) a substantial portion of the corporate transactions and wrongs complained of herein
 17 occurred here; and (c) Defendants have received substantial compensation and other transfers of money
 18 here by doing business here and engaging in activities having an effect in this District.

19 **PARTIES AND RELEVANT NON-PARTIES**

20 13. Plaintiff invested in the Paragon ICO on September 21, 2017, September 23, 2017,
 21 September 28, 2017, September 30, 2017, October 3, 2017, and October 15, 2017, by transmitting
 22 0.04095 BTC, 0.03975 BTC, 0.57855 ETH, 0.0231 BTC, 0.03495 BTC, and 0.04579484 BTC,
 23 respectively, to Defendants.

24 14. Defendant Paragon is a Delaware corporation that was incorporated on July 6, 2017.
 25 Defendant Paragon is controlled by Defendant VerSteeg and Defendant Lavrov. Defendant Paragon is
 26 the “operating entity” for the PRG Token project.⁸

27
 28 ⁸ *Id.* at 38.

1 15. Defendant VerSteeg is the Chief Executive Officer (“CEO”) and founder of Defendant
 2 Paragon. Defendant VerSteeg is a former Miss Iowa and Amazing Race participant. In 2016,
 3 Defendant VerSteeg founded AuBox, a marijuana delivery service, that is “on pause” while Defendant
 4 VerSteeg focuses on Defendant Paragon’s operations.⁹ Defendant Versteeg resides in the State of
 5 California, within the District.

6 16. Defendant Lavrov is the “Chief Creative Officer” and founder of Defendant Paragon.
 7 Defendant Lavrov describes himself as a “serial entrepreneur” who has had “multiple multimillion
 8 dollar exits.” Defendant Lavrov claims to have created numerous successful ventures. Such ventures
 9 have included: two phone game app development companies, Zila Networks and Karma World LLC,
 10 and Pravda Sushi Bar & Lounge—all three of which are defunct. Additionally, Defendant Lavrov
 11 founded tattolizer.com, a website launched to run an online contest for artists to submit work that
 12 Defendant Lavrov would then have tattooed on himself. For this project, Defendant Lavrov issued a
 13 press release on Business Wire, in which he described himself as a “leading luxury life figure” that was
 14 a “cult figure” for a “new group of rich young Russians defined by their conspicuous consumption as
 15 well as their open disdain for poverty.”¹⁰ Currently, Defendant Lavrov holds himself out as a venture
 16 capitalist that runs “Zila Ventures,” which has a team of one—Defendant Lavrov.¹¹ Zila Ventures
 17 claims to have three portfolio companies: AuBox (Defendant VerSteeg’s company); Proffi, Inc. (a
 18 company that has no online presence other than a single sentence on the Zila Ventures’ website); and
 19 Peak Mediation, Inc. (a marketing company that claims to “Guarantee to Double Your Profit”).¹²
 20 Defendant Lavrov also holds himself out as the CEO of Peak Mediation, Inc. Defendant Lavrov is
 21 believed to have residences in the State of California and the State of Florida.

22
 23
 24 ⁹ See Emerson Woods, *Featured Cannapreneur Jessica Versteeg, CEO of Paragon Coin*, (Oct. 28,
 2017), <https://cannabismagazine.com/jessica-versteeg-ceo-paragon-coin/>.

25 ¹⁰ See *Innovative Tattoo Design Contest at Tattolizer.com Invites Entrants to make Their Make on a Millionaire*, BusinessWire.com (July 24, 2008), <https://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20080724005337/en/Innovative-Tattoo-Design-Contest-Tattolizer.com-Invites-Entrants>.

26 ¹¹ See ZilaVentures, <http://zilaventures.com/> (last visited Jan. 30, 2018).

27 ¹² See Peak Mediation, <https://peakmediation.com/about.html> (last visited Jan. 30, 2018).

17. Defendant VerSteeg and Defendant Lavrov have been married to each other at all relevant times referred to herein.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

18. Plaintiff brings this action individually and as a class action on behalf of all investors in the Paragon ICO who are being, and will be, harmed by Defendants' actions described herein (the "Class"), absent judicial intervention. Excluded from the Class are Defendants herein and any person, firm, trust, corporation, or other entity related to, controlled by, or affiliated with, any Defendant, including the immediate family members of the Individual Defendants.

19. This action is properly maintainable as a class action under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23.

20. While the exact number of Class members is presently unknown to Plaintiff and can only be ascertained through discovery, Plaintiff believes that there are thousands of members in this Class. All members of the Class may be identified by records maintained by Defendants and may be notified of the pendency of this action by mail, using forms of notice similar to that customarily used in securities class actions.

21. There are questions of law and fact which are common to the Class and which predominate over questions affecting any individual Class member. The common questions include, *inter alia*, the following: (i) whether Defendants offered and sold unregistered securities, in violation of the federal securities laws, to the Class during the Paragon ICO; (ii) whether Plaintiff and other Class members will suffer irreparable harm if such securities laws violations are not remedied; and (iii) whether the Class is entitled to injunctive, compensatory, and/or rescissory relief as a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct as alleged herein.

22. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the other members of the Class and Plaintiff does not have any interests adverse to the Class. Plaintiff and the other members of the Class have all sustained harm in a substantially identical manner as a result of Defendants' wrongful conduct as alleged herein.

23. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class and has retained competent counsel experienced in litigation of this nature.

24. The prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the Class would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the Class, which could establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants.

25. Plaintiff anticipates that there will be no difficulty in the management of this litigation. A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy.

26. Defendants have acted on grounds generally applicable to the Class with respect to the matters complained of herein, thereby making appropriate the relief sought herein with respect to the Class as a whole.

27. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks injunctive and other equitable relief on behalf of himself and the Class to prevent the irreparable injury they will continue to suffer absent judicial intervention.

SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

Background on the Paragon ICO and the Paragon Business Model

28. On August 15, 2017, Defendants released the *Paragon Whitepaper Version 1.0* (the “Whitepaper”). The Whitepaper described Defendant Paragon as providing solutions for essentially every issue facing the cannabis industry. The “business model” and Whitepaper—which is replete with buzz-words relating to cryptocurrency technology—can best be described as overly ambitious, vague, and impractical.

29. The Whitepaper described Defendant Paragon as having five separate business segments: “ParagonChain,” “ParagonCoin,” “ParagonSpace,” “ParagonOnline,” and “ParagonAccelerator.”¹³ As detailed below, even individually, each of these segments claims to accomplish fantastic feats and unrealistically address major issues.

30. “ParagonChain” was described as an “immutable ledger for all industry related data.”¹⁴ The Whitepaper continues by explaining that the new “ParagonChain” and its use of “smart contracts” would “save companies hundreds of thousands in reduced paperwork” and provide a “modular toolset

¹³ *Supra*, note 5 at pg. 8.

14 *Id.*

1 to build applications that can track shipments, verify potency, identify medical patients and their
 2 prescriptions, and a host of applications not yet imagined.”¹⁵

3 31. “ParagonCoin” was described as “offer[ing] payment for industry related services and
 4 supplies.”¹⁶ The Whitepaper further describes “ParagonCoin” as being able to “create a global
 5 ecosystem where businesses and consumers can quickly and easily verifiably transfer funds—business
 6 to business, business to consumer, and/or consumer to consumer.”¹⁷ Additionally, Defendants stressed:
 7 “[w]e want to keep the value of PRG strong and growing.”¹⁸

8 32. “ParagonSpace” was described as “establish[ing] niche co-working spaces.”¹⁹ The
 9 Whitepaper added: “Our mission is to create a safe physical space where advocates can push to repeal
 10 current regulatory restrictions and present information on the benefits of marijuana use for medical
 11 conditions, recreational use, and general well being.”²⁰

12 33. “ParagonOnline” was described as “organiz[ing] and unit[ing] global legalization
 13 efforts.”²¹ The Whitepaper described this segment as “ParagonOnline will act as a one-stop service
 14 and platform for cannabis and alternative payment-related scientists, journalists, investors, marketers,
 15 doctors, developers, fintech specialists, entrepreneurs, startups, and lawyers. Because every business
 16 is a human venture, the professional networking potential will be highly beneficial. It will give the
 17 cannabis industry a whole new dimension.”²²

18 34. “ParagonAccelerator” was described as “bring[ing] standardization of licensing, lab
 19 testing, transactions, supply chain and ID verification through apps built” in the accelerator.²³ The
 20 Whitepaper further stated: “The ParagonAccelerator is uniquely linked to the growth of the legal

21 ¹⁵ *Id.* at pg. 9.

22 ¹⁶ *Id.* at pg. 8.

23 ¹⁷ *Id.* at pg. 12.

24 ¹⁸ *Id.* at pg. 15.

25 ¹⁹ *Id.* at pg. 8.

26 ²⁰ *Id.* at pg. 16.

27 ²¹ *Id.* at pg. 8.

28 ²² *Id.* at pg. 21.

29 ²³ *Id.* at pg. 8.

1 cannabis industry. Our model grows and develops with the industry autonomously, responding to the
 2 demand for new businesses with revolutionary ideas.”²⁴

3 35. While the Whitepaper claimed that there would be five business segments, it is clear
 4 that Defendants’ actual business model was primarily focused on investing in real estate. Specifically,
 5 the Whitepaper—very briefly—stated, “[t]he lion’s share of the token crowdsale [sic] proceeds will be
 6 spent on real-estate acquisition.”²⁵ Evidently, the Paragon ICO was simply a method for Defendants
 7 to raise capital in order to purchase real estate investments.

8 ***The Paragon ICO***

9 36. Defendants began marketing the Paragon ICO in August 2017 by enlisting celebrity
 10 endorsers. For example, in early August 2017, Defendants recruited Jayceon Terrell Taylor, a rapper
 11 known as “The Game,” to help promote the Paragon ICO.²⁶

12 37. The Paragon Whitepaper explained that “[a] total of 200,000 PRG will be generated”
 13 and that “[t]here will be no further production of tokens so, over time, the tokens in circulation shall
 14 reduce in number and increase in demand.”²⁷

15 38. The Paragon ICO was marketed as an investment opportunity for persons interested in
 16 the cannabis industry. For example, the Whitepaper stated, “the token crowdsale [sic] will favor
 17 smaller investors who are committed to the cannabis cause and plan on participating in the
 18 community.”²⁸

19 39. Defendants explained that their organization and plans would “quickly strengthen the
 20 legalization movement and [was] expected to positively influence the demand for and respectively
 21 value of Paragon’s cryptocurrency, PRG.”²⁹

22
 23 ²⁴ *Id.* at pg. 23.

24 ²⁵ *Id.* at pg. 18.

25 ²⁶ See, e.g., Frank Chaparro, *The Game is promoting the initial coin offering of a company owned by a former Miss Iowa who is looking to usher in the weed revolution*, BusinessInsider (Aug. 11, 2017, 5:14 p.m.), <http://www.businessinsider.com/rapper-the-game-promoting-weed-company-ico-2017-8>.

26 ²⁷ *Supra*, note 5 at pg. 12.

27 ²⁸ *Id.* at pg. 14.

28 ²⁹ *Id.* at pg. 8.

40. Similarly, on September 3, 2017, a publication named “NowThis Weed” published a video interview with Defendant VerSteeg on Facebook, which Defendants subsequently reposted on Defendant Paragon’s Facebook page on the same day.³⁰ Following are five screens captures from this video—each which stated “SOURCE: Paragon”—that clearly exhibit Defendants’ intention to market the Paragon ICO and PRG Tokens as investment opportunities:



³⁰ See Paragon Coin, *Now This Weed's* video, Facebook (Sept. 3, 2017), <https://www.facebook.com/paragoncoin/posts/192468519111339>.



1 **Paragon Coin** shared NowThis Weed's video.
2

3 September 3, 2017 ·



4 **Paragon Coin** shared NowThis Weed's video.
5

6 September 3, 2017 ·





1 41. Similarly, the Whitepaper stated, “PRG is designed to appreciate in value as our
 2 solutions are adopted throughout the cannabis industry and around the world. Our model incentivizes
 3 PRG owners to hold their tokens as long term [sic] growth assets”³¹

4 42. Indeed, Defendants even stated they would create a separate fund of PRG Tokens that
 5 would be specifically earmarked for manipulating and artificially controlling the price of PRG Tokens.
 6 Specifically, the Whitepaper stated that “40,000,000 [PRG] tokens [would be] allotted for Paragon
 7 controlled reserve to maintain price support of the PRG Tokens.”³² The “Controlled Reserve Fund”
 8 would have “two core functions to keep PRG stable.”³³

9 43. The “Controlled Reserve Fund” would be used to “Release PRG to the markets if PRG
 10 deflates too fast and pushes token prices up too rapidly” or “[b]uy PRG from the market if PRG price
 11 devalues too much.”³⁴ Defendants elaborated on the second “core function” by explaining that “PRG
 12 may become subject to excessive sell volume resulting in a significant drop in price. To counter this,
 13 the Reserve Fund can intervene by buying back PRG in an effort to stabilize the market price.”³⁵

14 44. Putting aside the illegality of a scheme to blatantly manipulate the market price of PRG
 15 Tokens as a security trading in the marketplace, this intention clearly exhibits Defendants’ message
 16 that the PRG Tokens would be appreciating in value, and thus, represented an investment opportunity.

17 45. In addition, the Whitepaper’s “Risks” section was almost entirely related to the risk that
 18 the PRG Token might lose its value or not have adequate liquidity. To quote but a few, the Whitepaper
 19 stated:

20 • “You should carefully consider and evaluate each of the following risk factors
 21 . . . the trading price of PRG Tokens (in the case where they are listed on a
 22 cryptocurrency exchange) could decline due to any of these considerations,

23
 24
 25 ³¹ *Supra*, note 5 at pg. 31.

26 ³² *Id.* at pg. 13.

27 ³³ *Id.* at pg. 30.

28 ³⁴ *Id.* at pg. 31.

29 ³⁵ *Id.*

1 uncertainties or material risks, and you may lose all or part of your PRG
 2 Tokens.”³⁶

3

- 4 • “No one is obliged to purchase any PRG Tokens from any holder of the PRG
 5 Token, including the purchasers, nor does anyone guarantee the liquidity or
 6 market price of PRG Tokens to any extent at any time.”³⁷
- 7 • “[T]he Company cannot ensure that there will be any demand or market for
 8 PRG Tokens, or that the Purchase Price is indicative of the market price of PRG
 9 Tokens after they have been made available for trading on a cryptocurrency
 10 exchange.”³⁸
- 11 • “Further sales or issuance of the PRG Tokens could materially and adversely
 12 affect the market price of the PRG Tokens.”³⁹
- 13 • “Negative publicity may materially and adversely affect the price of the PRG
 14 Tokens.”⁴⁰
- 15 • “[T]he development of the PARAGONCOIN platform and launch of the
 16 anticipated PARAGONCOIN future business lines may not be completed and
 17 there is no assurance that it will be launched at all. As such, distributed PRG
 18 Tokens may hold little worth or value.”⁴¹
- 19 • “Any events or circumstances which adversely affect ParagonCoin, Inc. . . .
 20 would correspondingly have an impact on the utility, liquidity, and the trading
 21 price of the PRG Tokens.”⁴²

22 46. As is obvious, the “risks” were primarily tailored to the risks that Paragon ICO
 23 participants would lose their investments due to the PRG Token’s loss in value or lack of liquidity.

24 47. In short, as stated in a review of the Paragon ICO conducted by Picolo Research:⁴³

25 1. The token sale structure is extremely complicated
 26 2. A significant amount of funds are used to ‘control the token price’
 27 3. There is no detailed ‘use of proceeds’ or budget
 28 4. The team have not communicated a clear commercial strategy as there are
 29 5 completely different segments

30 ³⁶ *Id.* at pg. 37.

31 ³⁷ *Id.*

32 ³⁸ *Id.* at pg. 38.

33 ³⁹ *Id.*

34 ⁴⁰ *Id.*

35 ⁴¹ *Id.* at pg. 39.

36 ⁴² *Id.* at pg. 40.

37 ⁴³ See Picolo Research, *Paragon (PGN) An immutable ledger for the marijuana industry*, (Sept. 7, 2017), <https://picoloresearch.com/26/paragon-pgn/attachment>.

- 1 5. We believe the use of blockchain within the ecosystem (in this venture) will
- 2 be limited
- 3 6. There is a strong focus on the establishment of Accelerators and Co-
- 4 working spaces as opposed to the blockchain initiative
- 5 7. The management team appear to be using the current market liquidity as a
- 6 method of financing for something other than the actual concept
- 7 8. It is unknown as to what portion of the funds will be held by management,
- 8 promoters, etc. . . .

9 For the reasons listed above, we **believe there is a significant risk associated with**
 10 **this token sale.** If the same structure and offering were presented by a company
 11 that did not put such high profile names to it, we would be on the verge of labeling
 12 such a token sale as 0 stars.⁴⁴

13 ***PRG Tokens Constitute “Investment Contracts”***

14 48. The facts are indisputable that Defendants participated in the offer and sale of PRG
 15 Tokens. Specifically, the Individual Defendants founded Defendant Paragon. “The PARAGONCOIN
 16 platform is developed, operated, and maintained by” Defendant Paragon.⁴⁵ Given that the Paragon ICO
 17 was conducted by Defendant Paragon, through its website, it is indisputable that the Individual
 18 Defendants, through Defendant Paragon, controlled and orchestrated Defendant Paragon’s actions in
 19 conducting the Paragon ICO.

20 49. Under the federal securities laws, the definition of a security includes an “investment
 21 contract.” Plaintiff’s and the Class’ investments of ETH, BTC, LTC, DASH, ZEC, XRP, XMR, ETC,
 22 or WAVES constitute an investment of money in an “investment contract.”

23 50. When determining whether a security has been offered and sold, the focus must be on
 24 the economic realities underlying the transaction. Here, the economic realities are that Plaintiff and the
 25 Class invested their digital cryptocurrencies in order to receive PRG Tokens, which they expected
 26 would be worth more than their ETH, BTC, LTC, DASH, ZEC, XRP, XMR, ETC, and/or WAVES
 27 investments. Plaintiff’s and the Class’ investment of such cryptocurrencies constitutes an investment
 28 of money for the purposes of determining whether an investment involved a security.

⁴⁴ *Id.*

⁴⁵ *Supra*, note 5 at pg. 38.

1 51. Plaintiff and the Class were investing in a common enterprise with Defendants, as the
 2 Paragon ICO investments were pooled under the control of Defendants, and the success of Paragon's
 3 "business model"—and thus potential profits stemming from the future valuation of PRG Tokens—
 4 was entirely reliant on Defendants' actions. As explicitly provided in the Paragon Whitepaper:

5 The PARAGONCOIN platform is developed, operated, and maintained by
 6 ParagonCoin, Inc. Any events or circumstances which adversely affect
 7 ParagonCoin, Inc. or any of its successor operating entities (collectively referred to
 8 herein as "ParagonCoin, Inc.") may have a corresponding adverse effect on the
 9 PARAGONCOIN platform and any future business lines. Such adverse effects
 10 would correspondingly have an impact on the utility, liquidity, and the trading price
 11 of the PRG Tokens.⁴⁶

12 52. Additionally, the Whitepaper stated:

13 ParagonCoin, Inc. may be materially and adversely affected if it fails to effectively
 14 manage its business operations as its business develops and evolves, which would
 15 have a direct impact on its ability to maintain the PARAGONCOIN platform and/or
 16 launch any future business lines.⁴⁷

17 53. Accordingly, it is obvious that any success from creating the PRG Token and future
 18 potential increases to the PRG Token's value was, and continues to be, entirely dependent on
 19 Defendants' actions.

20 ***Necessity for Judicial Intervention***

21 54. On July 25, 2017, the SEC issued a report on "the DAO," which offered tokens for sale
 22 online, in which the SEC advised those using "distributed ledger or blockchain-enabled means for
 23 capital raising, to take appropriate steps to ensure compliance" with the federal securities laws, and
 24 stated that "[a]ll securities offered and sold in the United States must be registered with the Commission
 25 . . ." or qualify for an exemption from registration. On the same day, the SEC issued an investor bulletin
 26 urging caution when investing in ICOs and to be mindful that promoters and initial sellers that lead
 27 buyers of tokens to expect a return on their investment or participate in shared returns provided by the
 28 project may be offering a security for sale.

29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000
 1001
 1002
 1003
 1004
 1005
 1006
 1007
 1008
 1009
 10010
 10011
 10012
 10013
 10014
 10015
 10016
 10017
 10018
 10019
 10020
 10021
 10022
 10023
 10024
 10025
 10026
 10027
 10028
 10029
 10030
 10031
 10032
 10033
 10034
 10035
 10036
 10037
 10038
 10039
 10040
 10041
 10042
 10043
 10044
 10045
 10046
 10047
 10048
 10049
 10050
 10051
 10052
 10053
 10054
 10055
 10056
 10057
 10058
 10059
 10060
 10061
 10062
 10063
 10064
 10065
 10066
 10067
 10068
 10069
 10070
 10071
 10072
 10073
 10074
 10075
 10076
 10077
 10078
 10079
 10080
 10081
 10082
 10083
 10084
 10085
 10086
 10087
 10088
 10089
 10090
 10091
 10092
 10093
 10094
 10095
 10096
 10097
 10098
 10099
 100100
 100101
 100102
 100103
 100104
 100105
 100106
 100107
 100108
 100109
 100110
 100111
 100112
 100113
 100114
 100115
 100116
 100117
 100118
 100119
 100120
 100121
 100122
 100123
 100124
 100125
 100126
 100127
 100128
 100129
 100130
 100131
 100132
 100133
 100134
 100135
 100136
 100137
 100138
 100139
 100140
 100141
 100142
 100143
 100144
 100145
 100146
 100147
 100148
 100149
 100150
 100151
 100152
 100153
 100154
 100155
 100156
 100157
 100158
 100159
 100160
 100161
 100162
 100163
 100164
 100165
 100166
 100167
 100168
 100169
 100170
 100171
 100172
 100173
 100174
 100175
 100176
 100177
 100178
 100179
 100180
 100181
 100182
 100183
 100184
 100185
 100186
 100187
 100188
 100189
 100190
 100191
 100192
 100193
 100194
 100195
 100196
 100197
 100198
 100199
 100200
 100201
 100202
 100203
 100204
 100205
 100206
 100207
 100208
 100209
 100210
 100211
 100212
 100213
 100214
 100215
 100216
 100217
 100218
 100219
 100220
 100221
 100222
 100223
 100224
 100225
 100226
 100227
 100228
 100229
 100230
 100231
 100232
 100233
 100234
 100235
 100236
 100237
 100238
 100239
 100240
 100241
 100242
 100243
 100244
 100245
 100246
 100247
 100248
 100249
 100250
 100251
 100252
 100253
 100254
 100255
 100256
 100257
 100258
 100259
 100260
 100261
 100262
 100263
 100264
 100265
 100266
 100267
 100268
 100269
 100270
 100271
 100272
 100273
 100274
 100275
 100276
 100277
 100278
 100279
 100280
 100281
 100282
 100283
 100284
 100285
 100286
 100287
 100288
 100289
 100290
 100291
 100292
 100293
 100294
 100295
 100296
 100297
 100298
 100299
 100300
 100301
 100302
 100303
 100304
 100305
 100306
 100307
 100308
 100309
 100310
 100311
 100312
 100313
 100314
 100315
 100316
 100317
 100318
 100319
 100320
 100321
 100322
 100323
 100324
 100325
 100326
 100327
 100328
 100329
 100330
 100331
 100332
 100333
 100334
 100335
 100336
 100337
 100338
 100339
 100340
 100341
 100342
 100343
 100344
 100345
 100346
 100347
 100348
 100349
 100350
 100351
 100352
 100353
 100354
 100355
 100356
 100357
 100358
 100359
 100360
 100361
 100362
 100363
 100364
 100365
 100366
 100367
 100368
 100369
 100370
 100371
 100372
 100373
 100374
 100375
 100376
 100377
 100378
 100379
 100380
 100381
 100382
 100383

55. On September 29, 2017, the Wall Street Journal reported Chairman Clayton as stating “I have yet to see an ICO that doesn’t have a sufficient number of hallmarks of a security.” This statement sums up the core issue here quite succinctly. Digital currencies are a relatively new phenomenon and various parties are taking advantage of the time it takes for regulatory agencies to address new developments to engage in unlawful conduct with near impunity, as Defendants have here by raising tens of millions of dollars with promises of profits and revolutionizing the cannabis industry.

56. On December 1, 2017, the SEC filed a complaint against PlexCorps for selling unregistered securities in connection with the “PlexCoin Token” ICO. Similarly, on December 11, 2017, the SEC announced that it had shut down an ICO that Munchee, Inc., a California-based online food review company, had been planning on conducting.

57. On January 4, 2017, the Texas State Securities Board issued an Emergency Cease and Desist Order against BitConnect, a U.K. based company planning on conducting an initial coin offering. More recently, on January 25, 2017, the SEC halted an allegedly fraudulent initial coin offering by securing a court-ordered emergency asset freeze over AriseBank, and its co-founders, which included appointing a receiver over their assets. It is clear from recent events that the rampant disregard of the federal securities laws taking place in connection with cryptocurrency offerings has been noted by regulatory agencies, including the SEC and state regulators. In the meantime, investors like Plaintiff and the Class have already been wrongfully deprived of the protections of the federal securities laws by Defendants. Fortunately, the private right of action provided for by Section 12(a)(1) of the Securities Act was created for just this type of situation, and provides strict liability for the sale of unregistered securities.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT I

Claim for Violation of Section 12(a)(1) of the Securities Act Against All Defendants

58. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the preceding allegations as if fully set forth herein.

59. Section 12(a)(1) grants Plaintiff a private right of action against any person who offers or sells a security in violation of Section 5, and states that such person,

Shall be liable . . . to the person purchasing such security from him, who may sue either at law or in equity in any court of competent jurisdiction, to recover the consideration for such security with interest thereon, less the amount of any income received thereon, upon the tender of such security, or for damages if he no longer owns the security.

60. From approximately August 15, 2017 through October 16, 2017, in connection with the Paragon ICO, Defendants unlawfully made use of means or instruments of transportation or communication in interstate commerce or of the mails for the purposes of offering, selling, or delivering unregistered securities in direct violation of the Securities Act.

61. The Paragon ICO was a sale of unregistered securities under controlling federal law. PRG Tokens exhibit the following particular hallmarks of a security under the *Howey* test: (a) in order to receive any PRG Tokens an investment of money, in the form of BTC, ETH, and/or other digital currencies was required; (b) the investment of money was made into the common enterprise that is Defendant Paragon and its potential future “business lines”; and (c) the success of the investment and any potential returns on such was entirely reliant on Defendants’ ability to launch the “PARAGONCOIN platform” and related “business lines.”

62. As such, Defendants have participated in the offer and sale of unregistered securities in violation of the Securities Act, and are liable to Plaintiff and the Class for rescission and/or compensatory damages.

COUNT II

Claim for Violation of Section 15(a) of the Securities Act Against All Defendants

63. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges the preceding allegations as if fully set forth herein.

64. Due to their ownership in and control over Defendant Paragon, the Individual Defendants acted as controlling persons of Defendant Paragon within the meaning of Section 15(a) of the Securities Act as alleged herein. By virtue of their positions as officers and/or directors and participation in and/or awareness of Defendant Paragon's operations, the Individual Defendants had the power to influence and control and did influence and control, directly or indirectly, the decision making relating to the Paragon ICO, including the decision to engage in the sale of unregistered securities via the Paragon ICO.

65. By virtue of the foregoing, the Individual Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the Class as control persons of Defendant Paragon under Section 15(a) of the Securities Act.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment and relief as follows:

A. Declaring that this action is properly maintainable as a class action and certifying Plaintiff as the Class representative and his counsel as Class counsel;

B. Declaring that Defendants offered and sold unregistered securities in violation of the federal securities laws;

C. Declaring Defendants are liable to Plaintiff and the Class under Sections 12(a)(1) and/or 15(a) of the Securities Act;

D. Preliminarily enjoining Defendants from making further transfers or dissipations of the investments raised during the Paragon ICO, or using such funds in any further purchases or transactions;

E. Requiring an accounting of the remaining funds and assets raised from Plaintiff and the Class in connection with the Paragon ICO;

F. Imposing a constructive trust over the funds and assets rightfully belonging to Plaintiff and the Class;

G. Ordering rescission of the investments made by Plaintiff and the Class relating to the Paragon ICO and/or compensatory damages;

H. Awarding Plaintiff the costs of this action, including reasonable allowance for Plaintiff's attorneys' and experts' fees; and

I. Granting such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff respectfully requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Dated: January 30, 2018

LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP

By: /s/ Rosemary M. Rivas

Rosemary M. Rivas
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 650
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 291-2420
Facsimile: (415) 484-1294

Eduard Korsinsky (to be admitted *pro hac vice*)
LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP
30 Broad Street, 24th Floor
New York, New York 10004
Telephone: (212) 363-7500
Facsimile: (212) 636-7171

Donald J. Enright (to be admitted *pro hac vice*)
Email: denright@zlk.com
John A. Carriel (to be admitted *pro hac vice*)
Email: jcarriel@zlk.com
LEVI & KORSINSKY, LLP
1101 30th St., NW, Ste. 115
Washington, DC 20007
Telephone: (202) 524-4292
Facsimile: (202) 333-2121

Attorneys for Plaintiff Astley Davy

CERTIFICATION OF PLAINTIFF PURSUANT TO FEDERAL SECURITIES LAWS

I, Astley Davy,

declare as to the claims asserted under the federal securities laws, as follows:

1. I have reviewed the complaint and authorized its filing.
2. I did not purchase ParagonCoin that are the subject of this Complaint at the direction of Plaintiffs' counsel or in order to participate in this litigation.
3. I am willing to serve as a representative party on behalf of the Class, including providing testimony at deposition and trial, if necessary.
4. I received ParagonCoin in exchange for my investment in the Paragon Coin, Inc initial coin offering. My purchase history is attached in the chart attached hereto as Exhibit A.
5. During the three years prior to the date of this Certification, I have not participated, nor have I sought to participate, as a representative in any class action suit in the United States District Courts under the federal securities laws.
6. I have not received, been promised or offered, and will not accept, any form of compensation, directly or indirectly, for prosecuting or serving as a representative party in this class action, except for: (i) such damages or other relief as the Court may award to me as my pro rata share of any recovery or judgment; (ii) such reasonable fees, costs or other payments as the Court expressly approves to be paid to or on behalf of me; or (iii) reimbursement, paid by my attorneys, of actual or reasonable out-of-pocket expenditures incurred directly in connection with the prosecution of this action.

I hereby certify, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 29th day of January, 2018.

Signed:



NAME: Astley Davy

EXHIBIT A

ASTLEY DAVY

PRG TOKEN PURCHASE HISTORY

Purchase Date	Coin Used (Btc/Eth)	Amount
9-21-2017	BTC	0.04095
9-23-2017	BTC	0.03975
9-28-2017	ETH	0.57855
9-30-2017	BTC	0.0231
10-3-2017	BTC	0.03495
10-15-2017	BTC	0.04579484